REMARKS

Applicants hereby affirm election of the invention of Group I, with Species being a light diffuser, Claims 1-22, for prosecution at this time, without traverse. Rejoinder of the non-elected species is requested in the event the generic claim is found allowable. Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the limitation of claim 10 therein.

In paragraphs 7-13 claims 1-7, 10-14, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ouderkirk et al. (543). The examiner states that Ourderkirk et al, discloses a light diffuser comprising a thermoplastic layer containing thermoplastic polymeric material and microvoids having substantially circular cross-section in a plane perpendicular to the direction of light travel having a diffuse light transmission efficiency of at least 65%. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ourderkirk et al. disclose a light diffuser comprising a thermoplastic layer containing a thermoplastic polymeric material and microvoids. However, Ourderkirk et al does not teach the microvoids having a substantially circular cross section in a plane perpendicular to the direction of the light travel nor does he suggest a light diffuser having a diffuse light transmission efficiency of at least 65%. The Examiner cites Fig. 3 as showing a microvoid having a substantially circular cross section. However, this Figure shows an immiscible discontinuous phase polymer material not a microvoid according to col. 10/ lines 39-43. Although microvoids are mentioned for certain embodiments, at col. 16/line 51, this is contra-indicated at col. 2/line 66-Col. 3/line 8.

The Examiner cites Col 32 lines 50-53, as reciting "having at least 70% of light polarized orthogonal to a first polarization of light is transmitted through said optical body with an angle of deflection of less than about 8 degrees." The "70% of light polarized orthogonal to a first polarization of light" disclosed is in relation to only one polarization state which means to one skilled in the art that at least 35% total light is transmitted (assuming the light was composed of the two polarization states equally, and the number 70% refers to only one of the polarization states of light). Further, the light is transmitted and deflected at most 8 degrees which makes the light transmission specular

transmission (according to the definition, Col. 6 lines 53-56) and not diffuse transmission or diffuse transmission efficiency.

The Examiner cites Col 34 lines 6-8 as disclosing that the light diffuser exhibits a light transmission is greater than 87%. The applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation. Col 34 lines 6-8 of Ouderkirk et al. states that at least 40% of the light polarized orthogonal to a first polarization state of light is diffusely transmitted. To one skilled in the art this means that at least 20% of the total light (for the reasons above) is diffusely transmitted, far less than the applicants claimed 87% total transmission. Therefore, Ourderkirk et al. is not anticipatory of the presently claimed invention and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In paragraphs 15-17 claims 5, 15-18, and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Ouderkirk et al. (543) in view of Aylward et al. (686). The examiner states that Ouderkirk et al. fails to specifically disclose microvoids containing cross-linked polymer beads having a particle size between 0.30 and 1.7 micrometers. Aylward et al. is stated to disclose cross-linked polymer beads having a particle size between 0.30 and 1.7 micrometers. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The examiner also states that Ouderkirk et al. fails to specifically disclose microvoids having an average volume between 12 and 18 cubic micrometers over an area of 1 cm^2 and where the light diffuser has a thickness between 12.5 and 50 micrometers. Aylward et al. is stated to disclose a light diffuser with microvoids having an average volume between 12 and 18 cubic micrometers over an area of 1 cm^2 and the light diffuser has a thickness between 12.5 and 50 micrometers. The applicants respectfully disagree. While Aylward et al. does disclose the preferred thickness of the light diffuser, Aylward et al. is silent on the average volume of voids over an area of the light diffuser. The examiner is directed to column 4 lines 50-55 of Aylward et al. cited by the examiner as disclosing volume of voids per area of light diffuser. The passage cited pertains to the void-initiating particle size, not the void volume itself per area of light diffuser. In fact, Aylward et al. disclose a spectral transmission of at least 40% (Col 9, lines 17-18), and states that the most preferred spectral transmission density for the biaxially oriented sheets of the invention is between 46% and 54%" (Col 9, lines 40-43). This is well lower than this applications claimed range (greater than 80% total light transmission) and would not be

acceptable in our invention as stated in the application page 7 lines 16-19, "Diffuser light transmission less than 60% does not let a sufficient quantity of light pass through the diffuser, thus making the diffuser inefficient".

In paragraph 19, claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Ouderkirk et al. (543) in view of Yamamoto et al. (011). The examiner states that Ouderkirk et al. fails to specifically disclose the impact resistance of the light diffuser being greater than 0.6 Gpa. The examiner states that it would be obvious to modify Ouderkirk et al. by employing the impact resistance of Yamamoto et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The applicants respectively point the Examiner to the abstract of the invention in the cited patent stating that the invention is directed towards a silicon nitride sintered body, not a light diffuser. In fact, the section of the patent the Examiner cited to state that Yamamoto is a light diffuser actually discusses the high strength characteristics of the sintered article. Furthermore, Yamamoto et al. is silent on any optical properties of his invention. The article of Yamamoto et al. achieves its high impact resistance and strength due to the sintering process of heating at various conditions to a temperature at or below 1650°C (Col 4 lines 5-6). Ouderkirk et al. discloses polymeric first and second phases that would not service a temperature of approximately 1650°C that ceramics can withstand and it is therefore concluded that the combination of the two teachings would not have a reasonable expectation of success. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing arguments, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-2625
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.